



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,467	02/26/2004	Kristopher Craig Whitney	ROC920030309US1	7026
30206	7590	08/15/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION			MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
ROCHESTER IP LAW DEPT. 917			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH			2113	
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			MAIL DATE	
			08/15/2007	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/787,467	WHITNEY, KRISTOPHER CRAIG
	Examiner Elmira Mehrmanesh	Art Unit 2113

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Elmira Mehrmanesh. (3) _____.

(2) Phillip Avruch. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 August 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 4, and 12-14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Emerson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,341) and Odenwald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,240).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Proposed amendments to claims 12-14 were discussed. Please refer to the attached summary for further details.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary

In an applicant initiated telephonic interview on August 03, 2007, with a follow up interview on August 09, 2007 with the applicant's representative, Phillip Avruch, the following arguments were presented with regards to claims 4, and 12-14 of the present application discussing the prior art Emerson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,341) in view of Odenwald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,240).

As per claim 4, the rejections of record and the amendment filed July 12, 2007 regarding the failure or malfunction of the input/output processor were discussed. Claim appear to have overcome the prior art, but are subject to an updated search.

As per claims 12-14, the applicant's representatives proposed an amendment with the possible cancellation of claims 13 and 14 and the addition of the limitations of the above claims to claim 12 in order to place claim 12 in condition for allowance. The Examiner stated that the proposed amendment is subject to further review and an updated search.

In the follow up interview, the Examiner stated that the proposed amendments of claims 12-14, fails to place claim 12 in condition for allowance.